

The University of Chicago

THE PROCESS OF URBANIZATION
AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR
A STUDY OF CULTURE CONFLICT

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

1941

By

MARSHALL BARRON CLINARD

Reprinted from
AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY
Vol. XLVIII, No. 2, September 1942

The University of Chicago

THE PROCESS OF URBANIZATION
AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR
A STUDY OF CULTURE CONFLICT

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

1941

By
MARSHALL BARRON CLINARD



Reprinted from
AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY
Vol. XLVIII, No. 2, September 1942

THE PROCESS OF URBANIZATION AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

MARSHALL B. CLINARD

ABSTRACT

The problem was the incidence of urban characteristics in the life-experience of property offenders and nonoffenders from areas of varying degrees of urbanization. Rural offenders were found to have had greater mobility than nonoffenders, their attitudes toward others tended to be impersonal, and they were not generally incorporated into the community where the offense occurred. Networks of criminal relationships were found to vary directly with the amount of urbanization of the areas from which offenders came. Delinquent gangs were not an important factor in the lives of farm offenders but were more so among village offenders. Offenders from areas of slight and moderate urbanization, in contrast to city offenders, were not definite criminal social types. Rural offenders were legal criminals but not criminals in a sociological sense. Farm offenders did not conceive of their acts as crimes or of themselves as criminals. Among village offenders there was less of the fortuitous element in the criminal act and more of a realization that they were committing an act against society. Definite organized criminal behavior was the outstanding characteristic of the offenders from the cities. As long as there exists a predominant measure of personal relationship and informal social control in the farm and village areas, it will be impossible for a separate criminal culture to exist. Without the presence of criminal social types, the volume of crime committed by rural residents will continue to be small as compared with that of more urban areas.

Several writers have recognized that there are quantitative differences in the incidence of crime in areas of varying degrees of urbanization.¹ Scientific explanations for this variation, however, have been largely of an a priori nature, since there has been little empiric research on the factors operating in the violation of legal norms in different types of societies. Durkheim was one of the first writers to state clearly that urbanization inevitably results in a greater amount of crime; and such a position has, in part, been validated by later research which, however, has usually been restricted to one extreme of the continuum of urbanization, namely, the great metropolitan areas. While these studies shed much light on the re-

¹ These have included Walter C. Reckless, *Criminal Behavior* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940), pp. 81-88; Edwin H. Sutherland, *Principles of Criminology* (3d ed.; New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939), pp. 44-45, 135-38; Louis Wirth and Marshall B. Clinard, "Public Safety," *Urban Government: Volume I of the Supplementary Report of the Urbanism Committee to the National Resources Committee* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1939), pp. 247-303; Hans H. Burchardt, "Kriminalität in Stadt und Land," *Abhandlungen des kriminalistischen Instituts an der Universität Berlin*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (4th ser., 1936); and P. A. Sorokin, C. C. Zimmerman, and C. J. Galpin, *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931), II, 266-302, 315-29.

lation of the phenomenon of urbanization and personal disorganization, they have been complicated by the clash of New and Old World standards of behavior in our great cities. Explanations for the criminal behavior of persons from rural areas do not necessarily follow from such findings, even though often tacitly assumed to do so.²

This research study sought explanations for the relation of urbanization³ to property crimes. It suggested, as a general hypothesis, that the relative incidence of urban features of life accounts for the differential in crime rates of different areas, and it sought to test various hypotheses relating to the presence of urban characteristics among offenders from areas of varying degrees of urbanization. The specific hypotheses tested involved the incidence of such urban characteristics⁴ as mobility, impersonal relations, differential association, nonparticipation in community organizations, organized criminal culture, and a criminal social type in the life-experience of offenders from areas of varying degrees of urbanization.⁵

In order to test these various hypotheses, secondary sources were utilized, and an intensive study was made of a group of offenders resident in the Iowa Men's Reformatory. The interest was not in Iowa as such, but rather in a selection of offenders who were from a uniform cultural

² For example, gang behavior as a definite precursor to crime is not necessarily universally true because it is found to be generally so in cities; to be universal such behavior must be found among less urbanized societies as well.

³ "Urbanization," as used in this study, refers to a way of life, a mode of living, as Wirth has referred to it, and not merely a certain aggregation of people. Wirth has pointed out that the primary characteristics of urbanism are size, density, heterogeneity, and impersonality (Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLIV [1938], 1-24; also "The Urban Society and Civilization," *ibid.*, XLV [1940], 743-55). Since the term "urbanization" as used here is not limited to cities, it is occasionally possible that a group of socially disorganized nomadic or frontier people, not living in cities, may exhibit a high degree of development of the characteristic features of urbanization. When incorporated into the comparatively "permanent" life of a city, it is possible for them to become less urbanized in the sense used here and incidence of crimes against property to decline.

⁴ "Urbanization" has been used with a similar meaning by Redfield: "The book will present materials in support of this proposition and in support of the conclusion that the disorganization, individualization, and secularization have not simply been conveyed by example from the city but are, in ways to be investigated, causally interrelated with mobility and heterogeneity and with one another" (Robert Redfield, *The Folk Culture of Yucatan* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941], p. xv).

⁵ For a more extensive presentation of this paper see Marshall B. Clinard, "The Process of Urbanization and Criminal Behavior: A Study of Culture Conflict" (unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago Libraries, 1941).

area, which meant that the relationship between urbanization and crime could be more adequately controlled.

In addition to secondary sources, primary research data were obtained by means of 200 detailed questionnaires and 116 life-histories. Rapport was established with each offender during several private interviews. Because of the care with which relations were established and maintained, as well as for various other reasons, it is felt that the data obtained were reliable. In the statistical analyses extensive use was made of chi-square tests, the coefficient of contingency T ,⁶ and percentage distributions (see Tables 1 and 2).

The 200 offenders in this study were assumed to be a representative sample of a larger group of 378⁷ men between seventeen and twenty-nine years of age, inclusive, who were white, had been born in Iowa, and had been sentenced to the reformatory between July 1, 1938, and September 1, 1940, for a property offense.⁸ In general, the group in this study was found to be of native-born parentage and with some high-school education. These 200 offenders were classified into three categories of urbanization, 60 from areas of slight urbanization (farm), 52 from moderately urbanized areas (village), and 88 from areas of extensive urbanization

⁶ The coefficient of contingency T , formulated by Tschuprow, allows one readily to compare tables with different systems of classification, whereas the interpretation of Pearson's coefficient of contingency varies with the degrees of freedom and, therefore, is not strictly comparable (for a discussion of T see G. Udny Yule and H. G. Kendall, *An Introduction to the Theory of Statistics* [11th ed.; London: Charles Griffin & Co., Ltd., 1937], pp. 69-71).

⁷ Of the total of 378 cases, the sentences of 21 offenders had ended, 24 had been paroled, 7 were on work farms, and 1 had escaped. Each of the remaining 325 offenders was interviewed over a period of several months and asked to co-operate voluntarily in the study. Two hundred and fifteen agreed to co-operate; and of them, 200 returned complete and usable questionnaires, or approximately two-thirds the total number interviewed.

⁸ A "crime" should not be regarded as a single entity denoting a uniform type of behavior, because personal and property types of crime are generally distinct in their nature. Although criminals are frequently studied without regard to the types of offenses for which they were committed (see, e.g., Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, *Five Hundred Criminal Careers* [New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930]), criminal research would be more effective if it considered separately homogeneous groups of offenders, such as those against property. The influence of functional changes in a society is reflected far less in personal crimes than in property offenses which involve the acquisition of things and not necessarily any personal or fortuitous situation. Crimes against property constitute by far the greater proportion of crimes committed in modern society, notwithstanding the greater publicity attendant upon personal crimes. No hypotheses are advanced in this paper for any necessary connection between personal crimes and urbanization.

(city). These categories designated, respectively, open country and places of less than 50 population, places of from 50 to 4,999 population, and,

TABLE 1

TABLE OF CHI-SQUARE TESTS ON 14 FACTORS FOR FARM OFFENDERS AND A FARM CONTROL GROUP AND ALSO FOR VILLAGE OFFENDERS AND A VILLAGE CONTROL GROUP

NUM- BER	FACTOR	CLASSI- FICA- TION (COL- UMNS AND ROWS)	DE- GREES OF FREE- DOM	FARM		VILLAGE	
				Chi Square	Approx- imate Proba- bility Signifi- cance* (Per Cent)	Chi Square	Approx- imate Proba- bility Signifi- cance* (Per Cent)
1....	Number of communities	2×4	3	23.5656	- 1	6.9328	+ 7
2....	Average number years in a community.....	2×4	3	19.6776	- 1	10.0352	- 1
3....	Longest residence in a community.....	2×5	4	13.0788	+ 1	4.5248	+ 40
4....	Proportion life in home town.....	2×4	3	19.1484	- 1	16.9568	- 1
5....	Number states visited..	2×3	2	5.4336	+ 7	3.7335	+ 15
6....	Years family resided in their community....	2×4	3	2.7674	+40	1.1227	+ 75
7....	Family-residence stabil- ity.....	2×2	1	1.0070	+35	0.9546	+ 35
8....	Number of organizations	2×3	2	20.8008	- 1	25.2224	- 1
9....	Average number of years in an organization...	2×5	4	4.5318	+35	10.0036	+ 4
10....	Number organizations held office.....	2×2	1	11.7640	- 1	22.2156	- 1
11....	Member group of boys who stole.....	2×2	1	0.0856	+75	0.0000	+100
12....	Member group of boys committed serious thefts.....	2×2	1	2.2011	+15	2.6775	+ 11
13....	Age first belonged to del- inquent group.....	2×2	1	2.8160	+ 9	0.6222	+ 45
14....	Association with boys with criminal record.	2×2	1	17.8568	- 1	21.2609	- 1

* These are approximations from Fisher's table of chi square (Table III). Significant probability is 5 or less (R. A. Fisher, *Statistical Methods for Research Workers* [5th ed.; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1934]).

finally, those over 5,000 population. These divisions were assumed to represent ways of life, the most personal intimate relationships being characteristic of the farm. Each offender was classified according to his major type of residence during the period from six until twenty-one

TABLE 2*

TABLE OF CHI-SQUARE TESTS AND COEFFICIENTS OF T ON 25
FACTORS FOR 200 OFFENDERS FROM AREAS OF VARYING
DEGREES OF URBANIZATION

No.	Factor	Classification (Columns and Rows)	Degrees of Freedom	Chi Square	Approximate Probability Significance† (Per Cent)	T ‡
1....	Distance first offense from residence	3×5	8	22.9646	— 1	.20
2....	Distance last offense from residence	3×5	8	21.4608	— 1	.24
3....	Number of organizations.....	3×3	4	13.0600	+ 1	.16
4....	Average years in organizations....	3×3	4	17.7497	— 1	.19
5....	Member group of boys who stole...	3×2	2	14.0595	— 1	.23
6....	Member group of boys who committed serious thefts.....	3×2	2	10.8924	— 1	.30
7....	Age first belonged delinquent group	3×4	6	27.4209	— 1	.13
8....	Number associates, first property arrest.....	3×3	4	11.5479	+ 3	.17
9....	Number associates, first property arrest, excluding single arrests..	3×3	4	8.7175	+ 7	.19
10....	Number associates, last property arrest, excluding single arrests..	3×3	4	8.6632	+ 7	.18
11....	Associate's age, first property arrest.....	3×2	2	1.3524	+55	.11
12....	Associate's delinquent record, first property arrest.....	3×2	2	2.0254	+40	.13
13....	Associate's delinquent record, last property arrest, excluding single arrests.....	3×2	2	0.0312	+98	.02
14....	Association with boys having criminal record.....	3×2	2	2.5702	+25	.08
15....	Number family members arrested..	3×3	4	5.7511	+22	.12
16....	Age first arrest (all).....	3×3	4	27.7000	— 1	.26
17....	Age first property arrest.....	3×3	4	26.8600	— 1	.26
18....	Age first conviction (all).....	3×3	4	22.8800	— 1	.24
19....	Age first property conviction.....	3×3	4	20.8200	— 1	.23
20....	Age first commitment (all).....	3×3	4	25.3000	— 1	.25
21....	Age first property commitment....	3×3	4	21.8200	— 1	.23
22....	Age at reformatory entrance.....	3×5	8	23.1200	— 1	.20
23....	Total previous arrests.....	3×5	8	21.8304	— 1	.20
24....	Number property arrests.....	3×5	8	20.3000	— 1	.19
25....	Number of incarcerations.....	3×4	6	13.0800	+ 4	.16

* Slight urbanization (farm); moderate urbanization (village); and extensive urbanization (city).

† These are approximations from Fisher's table of chi square (Table III). Significant probability is 5 or less (Fisher, *op. cit.*).

‡ For a discussion of the coefficient of contingency T see G. Udny Yule and H. G. Kendall, *An Introduction to the Theory of Statistics* (11th ed.; London: Charles Griffin & Co., Ltd., 1937), pp. 69-71.

years of age instead of by the last residence, as has been frequently done in other studies.

Although the degree of urbanization actually operated as a control factor, an additional control of farm and village nonoffenders was added. The control group consisted of 98 University of Iowa undergraduate students from areas of slight and moderate urbanization and 10 farm high-school graduates, all selected as comparable to the offenders in sex, race, age, nativity, and economic status. While no group of persons could ever be perfectly matched, it is felt that this group afforded a fair degree of control in connection with the hypotheses studied.

MOBILITY

The rural offenders were found to have had extensive contacts outside of their home communities, and their mobility,⁹ as measured by changes in locality and frequency of outside contacts, was greater than that of the nonoffenders. The farm and village offenders had a significantly¹⁰ larger number of residences, had shorter average residences in one community, and had spent a smaller proportion of their lives in the communities they called their "home towns." The rural offenders seemed to develop a conception of themselves as not attached to a community and a conception of others that was impersonal. The parents of these farm and village offenders, however, exhibited a number of stable characteristics, indicating that their offspring were participating in a different type of social world, a more mobile society, than the one in which the parents interacted.

The offenders from areas of slight and moderate urbanization considered themselves mobile persons. This conception of themselves is of paramount importance in explaining their behavior in a world in which mobility is becoming general. Mobility, facilitated by the auto, gave the rural offenders participation in a larger impersonal world and, in a sense, emancipated them from their home communities and made them dissatisfied with these. The more important contacts of the rural offenders were largely in the area outside their home communities; their attitudes toward other persons tended to be impersonal.

Among the rural offenders the place where the crime occurred was generally not the same as the residence of the offender. The crime frequently

⁹ The concept of mobility is used here in the same sense as given by Elliott and Merrill: "Mobility may be generally defined as spatial change which involves new mental contacts" (*Social Disorganization* [New York: Harper & Bros., 1934], p. 201).

¹⁰ Where differences, as measured by the chi-square test, were so great that they could have occurred by chance five or less times in a hundred, they are here referred to as statistically significant (see Tables 1 and 2 for actual figures).

was committed in another community in order (1) to avoid detection by those who, because of personal contacts, knew the offender; (2) to secure opportunity for the crime; or (3) in order not to commit an offense against someone whom the offender knew. In the everyday life of those living in the city the opportunity is present for an impersonal relationship in committing a crime, whereas in farm and village communities it must be sought.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The rural offenders did not participate so frequently in community organizations and groups as did rural nonoffenders. Thus the impersonality in the lives of the farm and village offenders seemed to be not only a reflection of mobility but seemed to be due also to a lack of general participation in community organizations. A large percentage of offenders from areas of both limited and moderate urbanization—36.7 and 21.2 per cent, respectively—were found to have participated in no community organizations. Both farm and village offenders participated in significantly fewer organizations than did nonoffenders; the farm offenders' average number of years' participation was significantly smaller; and there was significantly less group leadership. This seemed to indicate the presence of urban phenomena in the life-careers of the rural offenders.

DIFFERENTIAL ASSOCIATION

Networks of criminal relationships were found to vary directly with the amount of urbanization of the areas from which the offenders came. In rural areas, as compared with the interstitial areas of a more urban culture, there was a comparative absence of continuity in the criminal culture. The contacts of rural offenders with criminal norms had been either entirely absent or of an occasional or fortuitous nature. The simple techniques of many crimes, such as forgery, committed by rural offenders suggested that prior association with differential criminal norms was not always necessary. Delinquent gangs, where present among farm and village offenders, were of a loosely organized character in comparison with city gangs.

Shaw and Thrasher¹¹ have emphasized the general importance of the relation of gangs to criminal behavior. In this study, however, delinquent gangs did not appear to be an important factor in the lives of farm offenders, although they were of some importance among village offenders.

¹¹ Clifford R. Shaw, *The Jack-Roller* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), *Brothers in Crime* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938); and Frederick M. Thrasher, *The Gang* (2d ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936).

Among city offenders gangs played a very important role. There appeared to be a definite relationship between the degree of urbanization and the extent of differential association with criminal norms. Moreover, the age at which differential association took place decreased with an increase in the degree of urbanization. This fact is of great importance in explaining the differences in the incidence of crime in rural and urban areas, for the volume and duration of differential association seem closely associated with the development of a criminal social type.

There was a comparative absence of discussions of gangs or of crime in general in the life-histories of the farm offenders—a fact not true of the city offenders. In addition, no significant differences were found in regard to the incidence of boys' gangs in the life-experiences of farm and village offenders and nonoffenders. This seemed to indicate that identification with a group of boys who stole was as important as contact with the differential association.

There was a significant difference between the three groups in the number of partners which the offenders had in their first property arrest. Approximately two-thirds of the farm, one-half of the village, and one-third of the city offenders had no partner. Where the offender had a previous arrest, no significant difference was found between these groups in the number of partners in the last offense. A comparison of the partners' arrest records showed no significant difference either on the first or on the last property arrest. Similarly, there was no significant difference among the offenders with respect to association, prior to the first property offense, with anyone who had been arrested or had served time. As in the case of the other above factors, however, this lack of significance may have been due to the size of the sample. Nevertheless, certain percentage comparisons stood out, for almost half of those from areas of slight urbanization had not had differential contacts of this nature, as compared with slightly over one-third of the village offenders and less than one-third of the city offenders. There was, moreover, a very significant difference in comparing the offenders with the farm and village control groups. Some 85 per cent of the farm and village control groups had never known anyone with a delinquent record, while approximately one-half of the offenders from these same areas had had some contact of this type.

The life-histories indicated that the effects of gossip and other informal controls on the offenders may be a probable explanation for the slight continuity of crime in rural areas. There was a continuous observation of the rural offenders by farmers and villagers, and there were attempts to restrict contacts of others with these deviants. This informal social

control tended to destroy the continuity of criminal culture in rural areas. It is difficult for crime to flourish without impersonal disorganized areas such as are found in areas of extensive urbanization.

CRIMINAL SOCIAL TYPE

In the heterogeneity of the urban community the existence of a criminal culture was found to produce a criminal social type,¹² characterized by criminal techniques, criminal argot, and a definite progressive criminal life-history. Offenders from areas of slight or moderate urbanization, in contrast to city offenders, were not definite criminal social types. The rural offenders did not conceive of themselves as criminals; the more urbanized offenders did.

At the time of their first property arrests, offenders from areas of slight and moderate urbanization were considerably older than offenders from areas of extensive urbanization. Over 90 per cent of the farm offenders were first arrested after they were seventeen years of age, while 40 per cent of the city boys were arrested before this age. This late entrance into delinquent behavior appears, in part, to be a product of differential association, which varies with different degrees of urbanization. A similar situation was true for the age at the first property conviction or commitment, although this fact might possibly have been related to differences in the judicial process in less urbanized areas. There was a decided difference in the number of total previous arrests as well as property arrests. In fact, more than twice as many of the farm and village offenders had never been arrested for property offenses prior to their present offenses, as had the city offenders. Data on the number of previous incarcerations revealed a similar conclusion. It is quite likely that the incarcerations of urban offenders, particularly at an early age, had important consequences in the development of criminal attitudes.

Crimes having complex techniques were found to be correlated with the incidence of urbanization. The seriousness of the predatory crimes which the offenders committed increased with the extent of urbanization. Such serious predatory crimes as robbery were seldom perpetrated by the rural offenders, indicating a lack of full development in criminal techniques. Thus, the crimes in which those from areas of slight urbanization engaged, in both their first and their last offenses, were of a comparatively simple nature, such as larceny and forgery. Particularly because the lat-

¹² This term is used here in the sense of Burgess' definition: "The term 'Social Type' does not refer to the mechanism of personality reactions but to attitudes, values, and philosophy of life derived from copies presented by society. The role which a person assumes and to which he is assigned by society creates the social type" (Ernest W. Burgess in the "Discussion" of Shaw, *The Jack-Roller*, p. 193).

ter type of crime is simple in technique, it appears generally unnecessary to assume prior differential association with this type of crime. Offenders from areas of moderate and extensive urbanization had a larger percentage of burglary and robbery cases, the figures for robbery increasing among the city boys as they continued to engage in criminality. Similarly, more progression in the types of crimes was found with the increasing urbanization of the areas from which the offenders came. The use of criminal argot was characteristic of the life-histories of city offenders. As compared with those from areas of slight and moderate urbanization, offenders from the cities had had extensive contacts with other deviant social types, such as prostitutes, "pimps," racketeers, and "fences." This indicated the criminal division of labor, as well as the general social disorganization permeating areas of extensive urbanization.

A characteristic of the rural offenders was that they did not regard their actions as crimes or themselves as criminals. It is obvious that this is very significant in accounting for the differences in crime rates between areas of varying degrees of urbanization. The life-histories seemed to substantiate a hypothesis that this noncriminal conception of self is an outgrowth of a limited process of urbanization. To develop a criminal social type there must be in existence some organized criminal culture which is at least tolerated in the area and through which deviant norms are transmitted. Criminal techniques, argot, and progressive association with others having criminal associations are necessary for a criminal career; and without their presence an offender may commit a crime in the legal sense without being a criminal in a sociological sense.¹³ The division of labor and heterogeneity of standards of an urban world make possible the existence of a criminal culture independent of the traditional culture. Where there exist the opposite characteristics of urbanization, such as general homogeneity of culture and more general personal behavior, it is difficult to identify one's self with a criminal world. Rural offenders are not criminal social types, owing to the fact that in areas of limited urbanization there have been few opportunities to become identified with a separate criminal culture.

Among village offenders, in comparison with farm offenders, there was less of the fortuitous element in the criminal act, more extensive criminal

¹³ The term "criminal" today largely refers to a legal criminal who may or may not be a sociological criminal. Life-histories, in particular, suggest that rural offenders are not criminals in a sociological sense. They are deviants, certainly and have aspects, of more urban types of personality. Rural offenders may violate the law without being sociological criminals, and, conversely, some urban persons may be criminal social types without ever being charged with a violation of law.

differential association, and more of a realization of committing an act against society. In comparison with city boys, however, there was still a marked difference. In fact, the difference was so distinct that one could not call village offenders definite criminal social types. The reason appeared to lie in the differences in the nature of the society from which they came. Although village offenders had become mobile and impersonal, they had continued to maintain a partial feeling of the power of intimate relationships which is the social control of the small town. The fact that they came from traditionally law-abiding families and that they were known in their communities tended to lessen their feelings of being at war with society, as was true in the case of offenders from more heavily urbanized areas. The village offenders did not steal for a living, and the gangs to which they belonged were not so rigidly organized. In brief, they possessed only in an embryonic state the features which criminal social types in areas of extensive urbanization exhibit in their fully developed state.

Definite organized criminal behavior was the outstanding characteristic of offenders from more heavily urbanized areas. They felt that they were playing a criminal role in society and that they were more or less at war with the police. This feeling was not shared by farm and village offenders. Furthermore, large urban communities furnished the city offender with greater mobility and impersonality than was present in the life-experiences of farm and village offenders. Organized criminal gangs appeared to have been instrumental in shaping the city offenders' conceptions of themselves. The stories of the gang, its members, and their activities associated with the gang played a prominent part in their life-histories, indicating that they had come to identify themselves with the gang. Their associations with these gangs usually started at an early age, and there was a developmental process involving progression in criminal techniques and the acquisition of a criminal argot, until crime finally became an occupation—the exclusive method of earning a living. Moreover, the life-histories of the city offenders revealed, in many of their families, a tradition of criminality and general disorganization, which contrasted with the more stable family life of the village and farm offenders.

It is suggested as a hypothesis that the continued existence of an organized criminal culture alongside the traditional culture requires the impersonality of a large population. Otherwise, informal social control would destroy the criminal culture. The life-histories revealed an almost exclusive impersonal control of the city offenders by the use of law rather than by the informal sanctions which still appeared to exert a partial influence on rural offenders. Moreover, the activities of a single city offender are

probably more numerous than the combined criminal pursuits of many farm offenders. This probably accounts largely for the quantitative differences in urban and rural crime. If one considers the meaning of the act to the offender, rather than the legal consequences, this quantitative difference would undoubtedly be even more striking.

It may be concluded that, the more individuals in rural areas secure a conception of themselves as partly emancipated from the controls of their home communities, the more opportunities there will be for the development of a behavior situation suitable for delinquent acts. The influence of urban desires will increasingly shift the attention of many rural youths to impersonal relations and also bring about contacts with differential behavior patterns. There will be increasing opportunities for the commission of crimes in an impersonal situation. It appears, however, that, as long as there exists a predominant measure of personal relations and informal social control in the farm and village areas, it will be impossible for a separate criminal culture to exist as is characteristic of large urban areas. For this reason it appears almost impossible to develop criminal social types in rural areas.¹⁴ Without the presence of criminal social types the volume of crime committed by rural residents will continue to be small as compared with that in urban areas. This does not, of course, rule out the possibility that offenders from large cities may increasingly commit criminal acts in rural areas. Cities up to now, however, have offered more fertile fields for crime, and the small town and farm appear unlikely to furnish equal opportunities.

U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

¹⁴ The problem thus arises as to whether or not society is to continue to incarcerate men as criminals who are not criminal in their attitudes, for without criminal attitudes the term "criminal" becomes merely a legal fiction. Imprisonment appears particularly vicious for rural offenders, who may not have criminal attitudes prior to commitment. The type of society in which a person has been reared should, it is felt, be very important in influencing judicial leniency, as are age, sex, and other similar factors. That this fact might possibly be realized in a more urban court does not necessarily mean that a less urban court, enforcing state-wide legal statutes, would be equally cognizant of this fact and, therefore, lenient to rural offenders. Various prediction studies indicate that rural offenders are excellent risks for both probation and parole. See, e.g., Elio D. Monachesi, *Prediction Factors in Probation* (Hanover: Sociological Press, 1932); George B. Vold, *Prediction Methods and Parole* (Hanover: Sociological Press, 1931); Clark Tibbitts, "Success or Failure on Parole Can Be Predicted: A Study of the Records of 3,000 Youths Paroled from the Illinois State Reformatory," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, XXII (May, 1931), 11-50; A. A. Bruce, A. J. Harno, E. W. Burgess, and J. Landesco, *The Workings of the Indeterminate Sentence Law and the Parole System in Illinois* (Springfield: Illinois State Printing Office, 1928); William F. Lanne, "Parole Prediction as a Science," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, XXVI (September, 1935), 377-400; Missouri Association for Criminal Justice, *The Missouri Crime Survey* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1926).

